

REMARKS

A telephone discussion between Examiner Shang and Dennis Smid (one of the applicant's undersigned attorneys) was held on April 28, 2009. The applicant and Mr. Smid wish to thank the Examiner for his time and consideration for such discussion.

Claims 2, 3, 7, and 8 have been canceled. Claims 4 and 6, and amended claims 1 and 5 are in the present application.

Claims 1 and 4-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Each of the independent claims (i.e., claims 1 and 5) has been amended herein to include revisions discussed during the April 28 discussion and to also include other changes. Further it is believed that the present application provides support for the features added to claims 1 and 5. With regard thereto and as also discussed during the April 28 discussion, reference is made to line 23 of page 9 to line 6 of page 10 of the present application. It is respectfully requested that the above 112 rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 4-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,940,143 (Igarashi et al.).

As previously indicated, each of independent claims 1 and 5 has been amended herein to include revisions discussed during the April 28 discussion and to also include other changes. As a result and as an example, amended independent claim 1 now recites in part the following:

"receiving means for tuning and demodulating a reception signal of a frequency bandwidth of a channel having an interference signal, said interference signal being mixed in said frequency bandwidth of said channel and having a highest peak level in said frequency bandwidth;

phase locking means having a locking range and a capturing range for attaining phase locking to only a frequency portion of said frequency bandwidth of said channel which includes said interference signal having the highest peak level in the locking range and such that other frequency portions of said frequency bandwidth are out of the capturing range;" (Emphasis added.)

As also discussed during the April 28 discussion, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is distinguishable from Igarashi as applied by the Examiner for at least the following reasons.

First, it is respectfully submitted that Igarashi as applied by the Examiner does not appear to disclose receiving means for tuning and demodulating "a reception signal of a frequency bandwidth of a channel having an interference signal, said interference signal being mixed in said frequency bandwidth of said channel and having a highest peak level in said frequency bandwidth" as now recited in claim 1. That is, in the circuit of claim 1, the reception signal has a frequency bandwidth and a channel associated therewith which has an interference signal. As such, the interference signal is in the same channel as that associated with the reception signal. An example thereof is provided in Fig. 2A and lines 16-22 of page 9 of the present application. On the other hand, the portions of Igarashi relied on by the Examiner for disclosing such feature do not appear to disclose handling an interference signal which

is in the same channel as a reception signal. Instead, it appears that Igarashi specifically discloses handling an interference signal located in a channel adjacent to the desired signal. (See, for example, lines 1-30 of column 7, lines 60-64 of column 10, and lines 3-7, 25-29, and 47-49 of column 11 of Igarashi.)

Second, it is respectfully submitted that Igarashi as applied by the Examiner does not appear to disclose "phase locking means . . . for attaining phase locking to only a frequency portion of said frequency bandwidth of said channel which includes said interference signal having the highest peak level in the locking range and such that other frequency portions of said frequency bandwidth are out of the capturing range" as now recited in claim 1. (Emphasis added.) As best understood, the Examiner appears to assert that elements 130 and 220 of Igarashi are the same as the phase locking means of claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that PLL 130 and controller 220 of Igarashi are not the same as the phase locking means of claim 1. That is, the phase locking means of claim 1 may attain "phase locking to only a frequency portion of said frequency bandwidth of said channel which includes said interference signal having the highest peak level in the locking range and such that other frequency portions of said frequency bandwidth are out of the capturing range." (Emphasis added.) On the other hand, the PLL 130 and controller 220 of Igarashi appear to be used for controlling oscillation of a first local oscillator 120 such that "oscillation is performed at a frequency corresponding to a desired channel. . . ." (Emphasis added.) (See lines 7-9 of column 6 of Igarashi.) As such, the PLL 130 and controller 220 of Igarashi do not appear to be used for phase locking to only a frequency portion of the frequency bandwidth of the channel which includes the interference signal.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1

is distinguishable from Igarashi as applied by the Examiner.

For reasons similar to or somewhat similar to those previously described with regard to independent claim 1, it is also respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 5 is also distinguishable from Igarashi as applied by the Examiner.

Claims 4 and 6 are dependent from one of independent claims 1 and 5. Accordingly, it is also respectfully submitted that dependent claims 4 and 6 are also distinguishable from Igarashi as applied by the Examiner for at least the reasons previously described with regard to claims 1 and 5.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been overcome, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional rejections and/or objections which the Examiner might have.


Application No.: 09/862,826

Docket No.: SONYJP 3.0-783

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: April 29, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Dennis M. Smid, Esq.

Registration No.: 34,930  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,  
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP  
600 South Avenue West  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
(908) 654-5000  
Attorney for Applicant

996995\_1.DOC